

Amendments to the Drawings:

The Examiner objected to the drawings because the drawings did not show the numeral of an item of a certain embodiment. Therefore, the support pipe (62) as recited in claim 21 is now shown in Fig. 6, was amended, which now shows to show support pipe (62) which was identified as (32). No new matter was added.

REMARKS

This is in response to the official action dated November 28, 2007. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 2, 4-29 are pending.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-29 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. All rejections have been addressed in the present amendment. Concerning the rejection in claim 29, applicant submits that claim 29 is dependent on claim 11, which included the antecedent basis for the term "reinforcement". Accordingly, all instances were addressed and this, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Concerning claim 1, applicant submits that a person of skill in the art would understand that the meaning of W/m^2 is Watt per square meter.

Concerning claim 5, applicant submits that a person of skill in the art would understand that the meaning of $k > 1000 W/m^2 \cdot K$ or $W/(m^2 \cdot K)$, of which k represents the unit for thermal conductivity in Watt per square meter times Temperature (By definition, the specific conductivity "k" represents the amount of heat that can be transmitted during a given time across a section of material with a unit surface and a unit thickness, under a difference of temperature of 1 deg.).

Concerning claim 6, applicant submits that claim 6 is dependent from claim 4 which sets out the successive steps of heating and cooling. As to the definition of GMP, applicant refers to page 3 of the specification, lines 25 et seq. which defines GMP.

Concerning claim 7, the Examiner stated that the "Claim 7 is indefinite for reciting the limitation 'Apparatus'. Since, the claim 6 recited the process". Applicant submits that it is not clear what the Examiner means by this. Claim 7 is in deed an independent apparatus claim.

Concerning claim 12 was amended to depend on claim 11 which sets out the antecedent "a reinforcement".

Concerning claims 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 26, 27 and 29, all antecedent rejections have been corrected.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 and 28 as being anticipated by Helbronner et al (1,141,056) or WO 01/91811. Further, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 28 as being anticipated by De Stoutz (3,934,042). Lastly, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 28 as being anticipated by Boucher (3,926,556).

The Examiner objected to claim 3-27 and 29 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In order to expedite prosecution, applicant has amended claim 1, which now includes the subject matter of allowable claim 3. Thus claim 1 is now allowable over the references cited. Claim 28 is dependent on amended claim 1, thus, this claim is also now allowable. Claim 2 is dependent on amended claim 1 and, thus, claim 2 is also now allowable. Thus, all pending claims are now allowable.

In view of the present amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-2, 4-29 are now in condition for allowance which is respectfully requested.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this response is required, Appellants request that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fee or credit any excess to Deposit Account
No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,
NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS

By Christa Hildebrand
Christa Hildebrand
Reg. No. 34,953
875 Third Avenue- 18th Floor
New York, New York 10022
(212) 808-0700